Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D.C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. IV, NO. 4, *Issue Number* 156, JANUARY 22, 1947 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

"DEFEAT IN VICTORY"

By Felix Morley

The Polish elections last Sunday, held under conditions which forced three official protests from Washington and three from London, give extraordinary timeliness to Jan Ciechanowski's book Defeat In Victory, published by Doubleday and Company this week.

This fascinating account of the former Polish Ambassador's wartime mission in Washington is background for the travesty of democracy enacted in the Soviet puppet state on January 19. It will help to prepare the reader for the eventual showdown on the betrayal of Poland. But great as is the importance of Mr. Ciechanowski's book in the field of international relations, it is even greater for Americans concerned with the preservation of their own form of government.

In his day-by-day account of how the Polish Republic was destroyed by its own allies, the wartime spokesman of that Republic in the United States inevitably reveals a part of the contemporary degradation in Washington. It is that secondary accomplishment which makes Defeat In Victory required reading for Americans. A corner of our own iron curtain is raised to give a glimpse of the New Deal as it actually operated. The story of mental and moral bankruptcy under President Roosevelt is not agreeable reading. Nevertheless, "murder will out" and we can be grateful to a distinguished European for his specific evidence on much which has heretofore been gossip.

To Mr. Ciechanowski the wartime betrayal of the American people is an incidental matter. His interest centers on our official contribution to the destruction of his country, and that story is appalling. But the way in which President Roosevelt helped to ruin Poland cannot be told without some consideration of his domestic politics. The revelations, with names and dates and places, are sufficient to give many a lead both to a conscientious Congress and to impartial historians.

How Poland was "sold down the river" is told in straightforward manner, with a humor which does much to relieve the tragedy. There is a wry smile in such incidents as the one in which Roosevelt is reported urging the Polish leaders to "keep their shirt on" while they were being dexterously disrobed of everything except their honor.

Copyright 1947 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Defeat In Victory opens with Mr. Ciechanowksi presenting his credentials to the President on March 4, 1941, when he began his second assignment as the ranking envoy of Poland to the United States -- the earlier post was from 1925 to 1929. The book closes with the withdrawal of those credentials, as the first official act of James F. Byrnes as Secretary of State, on July 5, 1945. The intervening pages tell the story of how Poland was made a vassal of Soviet Russia. The author makes few editorial comments. He lets the facts speak for themselves.

It was during this initial interview, the United States being still officially neutral, that Mr. Roosevelt in effect told Ciechanowski to urge Americans, especially Polish-Americans, to scrap neutrality. His "deep feeling" for Americans of Polish descent, he told the Ambassador "jovially," was "not merely because they voted for me so overwhelmingly in the last three elections." Also in March, 1941, General Sikorski was allegedly requested to arouse Polish-Americans against the neutrality legislation which Mr. Roosevelt was under oath to uphold.

The sequel to these devious tactics came during the 1944 election campaign when, as Mr. Ciechanowski points out, the Polish-Americans had good reason to fear that President Roosevelt was planning to surrender their Fatherland to Communist control. At that time the Ambassador "was frequently asked . . . by election agents of the New Deal" his opinion of "the most appropriate way to obtain the support of what they called 'the Polish vote' for the Democratic machine."

Mr. Ciechanowski then relates how, a week before the 1944 Presidential election, Mr. Roosevelt saw Charles Rozmarek, chairman of the Polish-American Congress in Chicago and "definitely promised him to take active steps to insure Poland's independence." Mr. Rozmarek, the Ambassador noted, immediately thereafter made a public statement "fully endorsing the Democratic ticket."

The joker was that just three weeks earlier, in Moscow, Prime Minister Mikolajczyk of Poland had been told by Molotov, in the presence of United States Ambassador Averell Harriman, that Mr. Roosevelt had already surrendered to Stalin. In Ciechanowski's dramatic words:

> "At this point Molotov made a surprising statement. He said that he saw it was necessary to remind those present that at Teheran President Roosevelt had expressed his complete agreement with the Curzon Line as the Polish-Soviet frontier and regarded it as a just solution which should be satisfactory both to the Soviet Union and to Poland, and that the President had merely added that, <u>for the time being, he preferred his agreement on this point should not be made public</u>. [Underscore inserted] . . .
>
> "Molotov added that he thought it useful to bring this mat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter up. He then turned to Churchill and Harriman and challenged them to deny his statement if they considered it inconsistent with the truth, 'because it appears to me,' he said, 'that Mr. Mikolajczk is not aware of this fact and is still in doubt regarding the position of America on this subject.'

"Molotov paused dramatically for a while to see whether Churchill, Eden, or Harriman would take up his challenge, and when it became evident that they were not prepared to do so, the conversation switched . . ."

III

As the former Polish Ambassador points out, it was the function of OWI to make the American people believe the interests of Poland were being safeguarded even as that country was actually being made over into a Soviet puppet. Defeat In Victory gives illustrations of the extraordinary manner in which this agency undermined our diplomacy.

When Russia broke diplomatic relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile, on April 26, 1943, Mr. Ciechanowski, in an interview on this crisis with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, drew the "special attention" of the latter "to the necessity of curbing the exaggerated pro-Soviet tendency of OWI propaganda at this delicate moment."

Mr. Welles, says Ciechanowski, "promised he would try to do so."

In the end the Ambassador realized that he had been too scrupulous for his country's good, under the rules as rigged by the New Deal. In his last official statement, July 5, 1945, Mr. Ciechanowski admitted:

"As long as the war lasted, the Polish Government itself contributed to this regrettable blackout of true facts concerning Polish-Soviet relations for the sake of Allied unity so essential to the common victory."

On the deceit surrounding the United Nations the Ambassador does permit himself a little open indignation. He is sardonic over the story that Mr. Roosevelt "invented the formula of the United Nations" which he "personally carried to one of the White House bathrooms, where Mr. Churchill spluttered his soapy approval." He calls the draft Charter which emerged from Dumbarton Oaks "a caricature of democracy in international relations." And on the actual launching of the United Nations, at San Francisco, Mr. Ciechanowski comments:

"The illusory 'unity' of the Big Powers, determined to dominate the post-war world, was being laboriously achieved at the price of fundamental principles of justice and democracy, sacrificed to that precarious 'unity'."

The Ambassador is also pardonably sarcastic over the conduct of American diplomacy during the regime of Mr. Stettinius, who "appeared to me to regard foreign relations as a mixture of publicity and propaganda." There is a painful passage in which Stettinius, then Under Secretary, confesses that he felt "very bewildered," and beseeches the Polish envoy's advice as to "the best line for him to follow."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Stettinius is not long depressed. Seeing the unfortunate Mikolajczyk off from the Washington airport, after the Premier's futile visit to Washington in June, 1944, Stettinius turns to Ciechanowski and exclaims, so the latter recounts: "Our friend Stan is a regular guy, and we shall do all we can to help in his undertaking."

IV

As the basis of a libretto for a musical comedy, Defeat In Victory would be a wow. There are wonderful wisecracks, as when Harry Hopkins is quoted as saying: "After all, what does it matter? The Poles are like the Irish. They are never satisfied with anything, anyhow."

But the factual diary of the former Polish Ambassador unfortunately does not picture an imaginary Throttlebottom regime, set off with a luscious chorus and designed to provide a relaxing evening. This book is the report of a responsible insider on what transpired in Washington while 300,000 American boys were dying with the assurance that they gave their lives to make a better world.

Between the lines of Mr. Ciechanowski's book, much that has mystified becomes more clear. From it one can understand why Secretary Byrnes resigned. The cruel responsibility for our new Secretary of State is now the drafting of a treaty for Germany which must seek to conceal the shameful wrong which has been done to Poland. Under the unhappy Churchill-Roosevelt formula the Russian robberies would be offset by awarding the Poles purely German territory which they do not want. The Polish Underground fully recognizes that this arrangement would perpetuate Poland's dependence on Russian direction and support.

Defeat In Victory gives the most naive reader a glimpse of the problem which is shaping up. Before long the Senate will have before it a treaty which will inferentially recognize American acquiescence in the atrocious Polish "settlement." There will then be no Roosevelt glamor and no OWI further to conceal and obscure the issue. In the cold light of the morning after, the Senate will either have to ratify a treaty which destroys every principle for which the war was fought, or else will have to reject it, ending all pretense of Allied unity.

As the former Polish Ambassador makes clear, any White House leadership worthy of the name could have avoided the dismal swamp of disillusionment which must now be traversed. It was the New Deal achievement to miss every intelligent solution, yet successfully to postpone the day of reckoning for Mr. Roosevelt's unhappy successor.

Reproduction or quotation is permitted only when credit is given to HUMAN EVENTS. Trial subscription, six weeks for $1. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective. Address circulation and business correspondence to: HUMAN EVENTS, 608 South Dearborn St., CHICAGO 5, ILLINOIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events VOL. IV, NO. 4

By Frank C. Hanighen January 22, 1947

A plan for cutting the budget, reducing taxes and at the same time maintaining national security is being privately advanced by certain civilians who held high positions in the armed services during the war. These "radicals," who in fact would be classed as "conservatives" by the so-called liberals, courageously attack the one large item in appropriations which obstructs the way of the budget makers -- the eleven and a half billion dollars tentatively set as essential for the support of the armed services. This huge sum, amounting to approximately 25 per cent of the budget, can be cut as much as five billion, it is claimed, without endangering our military position or our international commitments.

It must be explained that the above-mentioned circles are by no stretch of the imagination "pacifist" or "isolationist." They have been prominent among those who opposed the curtailing of military budgets between World War I and World War II; and in the lexicon of the Left they would be called "red-baiters" and "anti-Russian." They dismiss as the "ravings of pacifists" the charge that the Army and Navy constitute a "military caste" and want to maintain their power. But they do believe that military leaders have become shortsighted and "reactionary" in their views as to methods of preserving our military position.

The two pillars of the aforesaid plan are: (1) the necessity of making our social and economic system healthy through sound fiscal and budgetary measures; and (2) a shift in emphasis in our military preparedness program. The first objective can be greatly assisted by the second. The advocates of the plan believe that a considerably reduced budget and lower taxes would stimulate industrial activity, maintain employment and high wages, release the energies and talents of our business men and industrial scientists, and for the next decade -- during which they envisage no threat of major conflict -- build up a powerful national potential, adequate to cope with any future international crisis.

The greatest emphasis, it is urged, in our preparedness should be on (a) the invention, development and production of new weapons of war; and (b) expansion and perfection of our Intelligence service, which could keep us warned of any foreign danger and the progress of other nations in the field of (a). It is not contemplated that the Army and Navy should be reduced to a mere skeleton. But appropriations should be allotted more sparingly than is officially demanded for the maintenance of establishments of arms and men. Nor is it considered desirable or necessary to eliminate at an early date our occupation forces overseas. Costly foreign commitments, it is believed, can be sharply reduced by wise diplomatic and economic policy.

Up to date, this column has been unable to obtain a breakdown of the surprising figure of five billion, the proposed reduction. But the Navy -- "the only real Navy left in the world" -- is ripe, it is pointed out, for the economy knife, and it seems that many Army installations scattered throughout the United States could be completely eliminated with substantial savings. For the rest, the shift of emphasis from mass armies and navies to New Weapons and Intelligence would presumably achieve the economy desired.

* * * * *

Briefs. - The Army-Navy unification proposal falls so far short of expectations that cynics are moved to say: "Now there will be four secretaries of armed services instead of two."

Due to fear of Zionist sabotage, Palestine will not be chosen as the western outlet of the two pipe lines which oil companies plan to construct from the Persian

Copyright 1947 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gulf area to the Mediterranean, according to experts on the Middle East. The oil termini will probably be located in the adjoining territory of Lebanon.

Mr. John J. McCloy is the fourth to decline the Presidency of the World Bank. With reports current that the constitution of that organization may have to be changed to give more power to the executive position, it is rumored that Mr. William McChesney Martin, presently head of the Export-Import Bank, will be offered what seems to be a contagiously unpopular job.

* * * * *

Washington lawyers who followed last week's Supreme Court hearing of the case against John L. Lewis and the miners are increasingly dubious as to the strength of the Government's case. They found grounds for this doubt not only in the arguments of counsel but in the questions asked of counsel by the Justices. Justice Frankfurter, it was especially noted, in a series of questions elicited answers showing that it was the intent of Congress (when it passed the Norris-La Guardia anti-labor injunction Act in 1932) to include the Government as well as private firms within the scope of the Act. It was also observed that Justice Black, usually considered Justice Frankfurter's adversary on the Court, likewise attached much importance to this point. (This column suggested on December 4, 1946, during the height of the coal strike excitement, that the facts about the intent of Congress might prove important if the case reached higher tribunals.)

Whatever the Court decides as to the scope of the Norris-La Guardia Act, another point is emphasized just as much and is the object of extended speculation by legal experts and interests involved. Whether or not the UMW are correct in their claim that the Norris-La Guardia Act did not apply in this case, did they or did they not act illegally in ignoring the injunction issued by Judge Goldsborough and in not awaiting the decisions of higher tribunals to whom appeal was made? Observers noted, in this connection, that Justice Stanley F. Reed commented on this particular angle during question time. He remarked that under such circumstances it would be easy for anyone to get an injunction pending a decision of whether another, possibly a fake issue, was legal. Justice Reed is often regarded as the balance wheel of the Supreme Court. Among the Nine, he has shown unusual independence in his opinions and his remarks are always the source of much comment.

* * * * *

The British Labor Government's use of troops in the recent food strike may have serious political effects, sooner or later. Since the trade unions are one of the main centers of the ruling party's power, this action has planted seeds of dissension. This development might prove a more important threat to Labor unity than the recent Parliamentary revolt of the Left Wing group led by R. H. S. Crossman.

* * * * *

General Marshall's selection of an Ambassador to China will be watched as an indication of his policy, as Secretary of State, towards that country. Ambassador Stuart was appointed ad interim and will be replaced soon, it is expected. Among possible successors mentioned are General A. C. Wedemeyer, former commander of our forces in China; Mr. John Carter Vincent, head of the Far East Division of the State Department; and Congressman Walter Judd. The first two are controversial names. General Wedemeyer was slated for the post last spring, but at the last minute his name was withdrawn, due to opposition from the Chinese Communists. Mr. Vincent is now the center of much criticism for his seeming partiality for the Communists. Mr. Judd, who has had wide experience in the Far East, is considered hardly friendly to the regime in Yenan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whoever is named, there will be the question as to what directive he will get from President Truman. Both Generals Hurley and Marshall were held to strict instructions requiring them to play ball with both sides impartially in the civil strife in China. It is reliably reported that General Marshall sought to break this rigid formula, when he was preparing to depart for his Chinese post, by writing his own directive, with an "out" permitting him to deal solely with the Nationalist Government in case he found his conciliation mission a failure. Mr. Vincent, however, reportedly altered Marshall's self-written directive, eliminating any such exception to indefinite impartial collaboration, and General Marshall submitted. Whether any appointee, recognizing the nature of the impasse in China, will accept a narrow directive, or indeed whether the White House and State Department will insist on such, remains unknown.

* * * * *

One of the marvels of the political scene today is the stubborn resistance of the Germans to the wiles of Moscow. Many observers had early predicted that the Russians would beguile the Germans into submission -- happy or unhappy -- and friendship. The elections in Berlin and the Eastern Zone have given the lie to this prophecy; the anti-Communist vote is always very impressive. What is the cause of this attitude? Most writers have attributed it to the wave of rapings and lootings which accompanied the Russian invasion; and to the general bad conduct of the Red Army -- "Europe has seen the Red Army." But the invasion is long past and restoration of Red Army discipline should have produced a change of heart on the part of the Germans towards their unwelcome guests. The principal reason is something quite different from any so far publicly recorded, say observers returned from the scene.

The truth of the matter is that the Germans have acquired an abiding dislike of and scorn for the Russians for the simple reason that the latter are not housebroken. From Stettin to Silesia, along and behind the iron curtain, the Russians have exercised their natural functions with so little modesty, not to mention cleanliness, that the Germans have been revolted. The Red Army soldiers, straight from the primitive habits of the steppes, have literally littered the streets, sidewalks and houses of the formerly immaculate East German towns and cities. Many a parlor became a veritable "cloaca minima" to the ineradicable horror of the hausfrau. The Germans cannot soon forget this experience.

This distasteful picture has come to us not only from returned American observers but from many private letters and reports from Germans in that area, which we have in our files. One should be reluctant to assign any one reason to a political phenomenon. But among the causes of the apparently miraculous adherence of the Germans to the civilization of the West must be prominently mentioned the German attachment to one of the products of that civilization -- sanitation.

* * * * *

A corollary of Felix Morley's Analysis this week is that policy investigations by Congress, instead of being curtailed or eliminated, should actually be increased. Coming at a time when the disgrace of the Yalta secret agreements is being emphasized by this week's fake election in Poland, the revelations of former Ambassador Ciechanowski show the need for extensive probes of New Deal personal government abroad as well as at home. Additionally, the publication this week of another authoritative book, George Morgenstern's Pearl Harbor -- The Story of the Secret War, should make more urgent the revival of the investigation which last year suffered manhandling by the Democrats. Obviously, no regular standing committees of Congress -- as the Democrats and other elements interested in suppression of the truth now urge -- can possibly cope with tasks of such importance and magnitude.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes and Quotes

When we first read the President's recommendations for universal training, we thought his secretary had impishly tried to satirize Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. There was her characteristic sort of retreat from realities into soothing phrases: "I don't like to think of it as a universal military training program." There was the substitution of the language of "goo" for the word "guns"; the emphasis not on "war" but on "welfare"; the attempt to make it sound like a nice, "white necktie" social service project -- "I want it to be a universal training program, giving our young people a background in the disciplinary approach of getting along with one another . . ." etc., etc. We are reluctant to believe that anybody can swallow this line without gagging. But since the psychology of New Deal goose-stepping has not entirely disappeared, the Christian Century is probably right in commenting on it all sternly and seriously, as follows:

"The old battle for control of the mind of the rising generation entered a new phase when President Truman set up his civilian commission on universal training. The terms of the President's mandate to this body point straight toward totalitarianism. They take ultimate responsibility for shaping the ideals of the young from the schools and churches and center it in the government in Washington. We have no doubt that President Truman abhors such totalitarian devices as Hitler Youth or the Young Communist League as heartily as does any other American. But a careful reading of his instructions to his new commission reveals that, regardless of his intentions, the chief executive's directions can have no other result than the establishment here of a similar device."

* * * * *

It has been the matter of some private comment that the publications of the influential Foreign Policy Association have fallen in recent years from their formerly high standard of unbiased interpretation. "Mrs. Dean's Foreign Policy Lobby," an article in Plain Talk severely criticizes the FPA and its Research Director, Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean, on the score of making propaganda to "appease the Soviet Union and to apologize for its expansion. . . ." The pattern of Mrs. Dean's apologetics seldom varies:

"(1) Point out that the Soviet Union is being criticized for some action. (2) Admit that the action is (slightly) 'deplorable.' (3) Show that Russia is after all not much to blame for what it has done, in view of the lack of 'understanding' between it and the West. (4) Show that the 'Western Allies' have committed misdeeds, too. (5) Philosophize about such chicanery being quite common in international affairs. (6) Point out that all such misconduct must be eliminated by strengthening the Big Three and the United Nations. (Occasionally step 2 is omitted)."

* * * * *

"For this peril in which Jews find themselves now in a great section of the world, they have to thank nationalism; not the old idealistic humanitarian movement of before the first World War known as Zionism, but the wave of chauvinism which was fostered in Palestine and from there radiated all over the Jewish world during the period between the two World Wars . . .

"The acts of terror in Palestine during this year have already done more to undermine the moral position of Jews living among other peoples than any other event in this country. What is happening now in England, where one of the most free and happiest Jewish communities in the world is being shaken to its very foundation, is a forecast of what may happen soon in Canada, Australia, South Africa, the United States and eventually all over the world." (From "March of Jewish Events," by William Zukerman in the American Hebrew.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED